UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/986,733	11/09/2001	Narendran Ramakrishnan	01640279AA	5865

7590	12/28/2004

LAW OFFICES
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD, SUITE 340
P.O. Box 9204
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER
THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/986,733	RAMAKRISHNAN, NARENDRAN
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hanh B Thai	2161	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>*amendment filed June 30, 2004*</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 4-12* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed June 30, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

        • Applicant argues on pages 6-7 that " Schmidt-Joos does not teach or suggest out-of-turn

query of interaction capability." Examiner respectfully disagrees.

        Schmidt-Joos teaches a method and an intelligent document format for producing and

processing documents including the step of "login" if the user or customer into the application

server (steps 21-23, Fig.2 and [0083]). It is beneficial to consider the claim limitation of concern,

i. e. "wherein the interaction sequences can be initiated by the user out-of-turn." The login

process disclosed by Schemidt-Joos reads on above limitation because before logging-in a user is

"offline". Being "offline" inherently implies that the user does not have a "turn". Even thought,

the user has been through some query interaction sequence, the user is still not recognized by the

server and thus will never be processed by the server. Now assume that the user needs to Internet

with the system in order to obtain some information. The user goes through the predetermined

login procedure of providing a user ID and a password. After authentication by the server, the

user now is on-line and will be considered in-turn. Examiner maintains that above login and user

authentication process was initiated by the user on an "out-of-turn" basis.

        • Applicant argues on pages 6-7 that " Schmidt-Joos does not teach or suggest

simplification (or any alteration) of a computer program." Examiner respectfully disagrees.

        Schmidt-Joos teaches a computer configuration to generate design variants of alterations

of the program content which is reduced the much simpler task for end user ([0009]; [0085];

[0086]; 0090]; [0096] and step 2, Fig.2). This cited paragraph reads on simplification (or any

alteration) of a computer program.

• Applicant argues on pages 6-10 that " Schmidt-Joos does not teach or suggest

generating a personalized information space." Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Schmidt-Joos teaches a web browser contains a dialog receiving information input

([009]). This input information corresponds to the information space and the information input

process via the web browser reads on "generating a personalized information space."

• Applicant argues on pages 10-11 that Schmidt-Joos does not anticipates claim 10.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Schmidt-Joos discloses the "server" and "client" computers are connected to network via

internet, the "server" can be a "client" in a peer-to-peer network thus the server can be visible to

the user and accessible for direct interaction. Therefore, "server" and "client" computers

correspond to the first window and second window in the interaction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2.   Claims 1-2, 4-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schmidt-

Joos et al (WO 01/86368).

Regarding claim 1, Schmidt-Joos discloses a systematic modeling methodology for

information personalization in an information system which automatically adjusts information

content, structure, and presentation to an individual user (see [0011], Schmidt-Joos) comprising

the steps of:

- modeling information-seeking interaction sequences with the information

    system wherein each interaction sequence denotes a possible dialog between the

    user and the information system (see [0009], Schidt-Joos);

- programmatically representing the interaction sequences in a computer program

    (see [0012]; [0069] and Fig.3 Schidt-Joos), wherein the interaction sequences

    can be initiated by the user out-of-run (steps 21-23, Fig.2 and [0083]);

- creating a personalization system by partial evaluation of the computer program

    to produce a simplified program (see [0010]; [0083]; [0079]; step 13, Fig.1 and

    corresponding text, Schidt-Poos); and

- generating a personalized information space for the user in a user interface from

    the simplified program (see [0028]; [0092]; [0096], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 2, Schidt-Joos further discloses that a dialog in the step of modeling is a

task-oriented information-seeking activity involving a list of information-seeking aspects

comprising structural aspects specified by the user and terminal aspects as responses by the

information system to the specified structural aspects (see [0009] and [0043], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 4, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of compacting interaction

sequences to determine a new set of interaction sequences having fewer states prior to the step of

programmatically representing the interaction sequences in a computer program (see [0010] and [0035], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 5, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of creating a personalization system by partial evaluation of the computer program uses a source-to-source transformation engine that simplifies the computer program for static values of some program variables (see [0020] and [0089], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 6, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of generating a personalized information space for the user in a user interface is performed by mapping from the simplified program to the information space, in terms of a technology corresponding to the information system (see [0086] and [0090], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 7, Schidt-Joos further discloses that the information-seeking interaction of the user is by means of a browser (see [0086], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 8, Schidt-Joos further discloses that the user interface is a browser window displaying an information space and a partial input specification window for facilitating user interaction (see [0016], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 9, Schidt-Joos further discloses that the browser supports a browsing hierarchy, said step of modeling being performed using a nested programmatic model (see [0016] and [0028], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 10, Schidt-Joos further discloses that the user interface comprises two windows, a first window allowing the user to proceed with an interaction along lines initiated by the information system and a second window allowing the user to take an initiative and personalize the interaction by specifying some aspect out-of-turn (see [0016], Schidt-Joos: The

"server" and "client" computers are connected to network via internet, the "server" can be a

"client" in a peer-to-peer network. This server can be visible to the user and accessible for direct

interaction. Therefore, a "server" and "client" computer corresponds to the first window and

second window).

Regarding claim 11, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of partially evaluating the

program with respect to values for structural program variables (see [0020], Schidt-Joos).

Regarding claim 12, Schidt-Joos further discloses the step of representing the

information-seeking aspects as values for structural program variables; performing a partial

evaluation with respect to the structural program variables (see steps 12, 14-15, Fig.1 and

corresponding text, Schidt-Joos).

Schidt, however, does not disclose the step of converting a resulting program back to the

information space. But Schidt discloses the step of generating a personalized information space

for the user in a user interface from the simplified program (see [0028]; [0092]; [0096], Schidt-

Joos). Therefore, the system of Schidt will be able to convert a program back to the information

space.

Allowable Subject Matter

3.   Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and

any intervening claims.

4.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the

prior art fail to suggest or disclose "organizing the set of interaction sequences in terms of

conditional elements on structural variables, using constructs provided in a programming

language; declaring all structural variables to be parameters in the program; and if an interaction

sequence produces values for terminal aspects, assigning values for respective terminal variables

in corresponding programmatic representation."

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

1. Kodosky et al. (5,732,277) disclose a graphical system for modeling a process and

associated method.

2. Ward et al. (4,802,116) disclose a programmed controller.

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

                                                    Hanh B Thai
                                                    Examiner
                                                    Art Unit 2161

December 16, 2004

                                    UYEN LE
                                    PRIMARY EXAMINER